REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 3-23 are pending in the application. Claim 2 is canceled and claims 1, 5, 10-12, 14-17, and 21-23 are amended to correct antecedent basis and also to more clearly describe the claimed invention. Support for the amendment is found in the specification. No new matter is added.

Applicants gratefully appreciate the Examiner's indication that claim 2, 7, 11, 12 and 13 would be allowed if amended into independent form and that claims 3, 6, 14 and 15 would be allowed if amended to correct informalities. Applicants have canceled claim 2 and amended claim 1 to incorporate the canceled subject matter. Additionally, Applicants have corrected the informalities of claims 3, 6, 14 and 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims contain allowable subject matter.

MATTERS OF FORM

The Office Action objects to claims 1-20 and regarding lack of antecedent basis. Applicants have amended the claims to obviate this objection.

The Office Action in paragraph 8, states that claims 3, 6, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 112, second paragraph. Applicants have amended these claims to obviate this rejection.

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments, Applicants respectfully requests the withdrawal of the informality objection and rejection to the claims.

PATENTABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 8-10, and 16-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 4,556,270 to Schutzle *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as "Schutzle"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As admitted in the Office Action, the prior art does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in Applicants' canceled claim 2. The canceled subject matter has been amended into independent claim 1 and also amended into independent claim 21. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 21, contain allowable subject matter. Moreover, for the same reasons, claims 4, 5, 8-10 and 16-20, depending directly or indirectly from claim 1, are deemed allowable for depending on an allowable claim, as well as for the subject matter recited therein.

Therefore, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Schutzle in view of United States Patent No. 6,045,385 to Kane (hereinafter referred to as "Kane"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 22 depends from claim 21. Therefore, for the same reasons discussed above, claim 22 is allowable.

Claim 23 recites a method for attaching and releasing a signal-path-linking component from a radio frequency signal path, comprising, providing a signal path for a radio frequency signal having an interruption coaxially terminated at both ends of the interruption, grasping handles on a linking component and urging the linking component into a position to complete the signal path at both ends of the interruption, attaching the linking component for situation at a

location where urged by a single motion of rotating and axially plunging the handles on the linking component to engage a catch fitting, and reversibly releasing the linking component from the latched condition by a single motion of rotating and axially withdrawing the handles on the linking component to disengage from the catch fitting.

Schutzle discloses a housing for a plug connector using a plurality of different type locking elements to enable the plug connector to be adapted to different types of locks. The plug connector is configured to have sides that are replaceable with differing locking elements and the plug connector is placed into a mating connector having a corresponding lock. See Figs. 1- 12.

Schutzle does not contain any disclosure or suggestion relating to the use of a coaxially terminated interruption. In fact, all of Schutzle's embodiments relate to simple pin-type signal systems. Moreover, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Schutzle relating to affixing the plug connector to a mating connector using a single motion of rotating and axially plunging/withdrawing the handles. Therefore, Schutzle does not disclose or suggest all the elements recited in Applicants' independent claim 23.

Kane does not supply the deficiencies in Schutzle. Rather, Kane simply discloses a processor module receptacle connector with a retention guide, and presents a circuit board optionally accepting more than one processor module, with a terminator module or no module optionally inserted in place of a processor module. These modules "clip" into a retention system. There is no discussion or teaching in Kane regarding a coaxially terminated interruption. Further, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Kane regarding a single motion of rotating and axially plunging/withdrawing the handles. Therefore, Kane does not supply the subject matter lacking in Schutzle. Thus, even if combined, the combination of Schutzle and Kane would not contain all the elements of Applicants' claimed invention.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that Schutzle and Kane, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest all the features of Applicants' claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants' respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney at if it is believed that such contact with expedite the prosecution of the application.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, Applicants petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2036.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP

Jonathan A. Kidney

Reg. No. 46,195

Date: 11/22/04

Washington Square, Suite 1100
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-5304
Telephone: (202) 861-1500
Facsimile: (202) 861-1783